

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN**

**ESTATE OF DEMETRIUS L. STEPHENSON,**  
*by Special Administrator Richard Coad,*

Plaintiff,

v.

**TELEPHONE CONFERENCE**

Case No. 22-C-956

**CALUMET COUNTY, et al.,**

Defendant.

---

HONORABLE WILLIAM C. GRIESBACH, presiding  
Proceeding Held: August 14, 2025  
Deputy Clerk: Kyle

---

Time Called: 9:03 a.m.  
Time Concluded: 9:47 a.m.  
Tape: Zoom 081425

---

**Appearances:**

**Plaintiff:** John Bradley, James Odell

**Defendants:** Ronald Stadler (HHS Defendants)  
Sarah Mills (Calumet County)  
Douglas Knott (ACH Defendants)  
Maria Schneider (Dr. Karen Ronquillo)

---

This matter was set on the court's calendar to address Dr. Ronquillo's Rule 7(h) Expedited Non-Dispositive Motion to Quash Subpoena Duces Tecum (Dkt. No. 315), the HHS Defendants' Rule 7(h) Expedited Non-Dispositive Motion to Bar Plaintiff's Use of Personally Recorded Depositions at Trial (Dkt. No. 318), the HHS Defendants' Renewed Motions in Limine (Dkt. No. 319), and the Rule 7(h) Expedited Non-Dispositive and Unopposed Motion to Permit Dr. Melissa Caldwell to Give Testimony by Zoom (Dkt. No. 321).

The court will allow Plaintiff to read Dr. Ronquillo's deposition transcript at trial; the court DENIES as moot the motion to quash subpoena (Dkt. No. 315).

Mr. Bradley advises that Plaintiff intended to use the Zoom video recording for impeachment purposes, not for their case-in-chief. If Defendants are permitted to use bodycam footage for impeachment, then Plaintiff should be permitted to use the Zoom video recording.

The court finds no difference between the Zoom video recording and the bodycam footage for use in impeachment; the court DENIES the motion to bar use of personally recorded depositions (Dkt. No. 318).

The court GRANTS the unopposed motion to permit Dr. Melissa Caldwell to testify by Zoom (Dkt. No. 321).

The court GRANTS the renewed motions in limine (Dkt. No. 319), permitting Defendants to use other acts evidence for reasons other than showing conformity and barring Plaintiff from questioning Dr. Buch about objective reasonableness.

The court advises the parties to be prepared to address the *Monell* claim.